

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,694	10/31/2003	Cullen E. Bash	100201724-3 9832	
7590 05/10/2004			EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			NORMAN, MARC E	
Intellectual Prop	perty Administration			
P. O. Box 272400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			3744	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			K
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
	10/697,694	BASH ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Marc E. Norman	3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
Period for Reply		(a) 500H	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 C	<u>ctober 2003</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,12,25,38 and 51-70</u> is/are pend	ling in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,12,25,38,51,52,55,56,58-61,63</u>			
7) Claim(s) <u>53,54,57,62 and 67</u> is/are objected to			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 October 2003</u> is/are	: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ objected	to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. is have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/31/03</u>. 	6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/697,694

Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 52, 55, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spinazzola et al. (U.S. Patent 6,412,292) in view of Yamagishi et al.

As per claim 1, Spinazzola et al. teaches a cooling system for cooling computer racks comprising a cooling device including fans 16 and 25; a plenum 4b having a plurality of returns 24 and an outlet 28 in fluid combination with the fans, wherein the returns are configured for removing the cooling fluid from the data center and are operable to vary a speed of fans 25 and thus a characteristic of the removal through the returns (see column 5, lines 39-41 regarding fans 25 being of variable speed). Spinazzola at el. does not teach the cooling system being driven by a variable capacity compressor. However, variable speed compressors are common and well-

Art Unit: 3744

known in the art of air conditioning. Yamagishi et al., for example, teaches a plenum-based system with a variable speed fan 32 wherein the cooling system is driven by variable speed compressor 14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a variable speed compressor such as that of Yamagishi et al. to the system of Spinazzola et al. for the purpose of controlling the degree of cooling performed by the system.

As per claim 2, Spinazzola et al. teaches the cooling characteristic being volume flow rate (in response to the speed variation of the fan).

As per claim 52, Spinazzola et al. teaches returns 24 having fans 25.

As per claim 55, controlling compressor speed is taught by Yamagishi et al. as discussed above regarding claim 1.

As per claim 56, Spinazzola et al. teaches varying the speed of the fan as discussed above regarding claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, 6, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spinazzola et al. in view of Yamagishi et al. and further in view of Nakazato et al.

As per claims 3 and 4, Spinazzola does not specifically teach independent control of fans 25 in the returns to independently vary the characteristic of the cooling fluid removal. Nakazato et al. teaches a similar arrangement whereby fans 7f of returns 7b from the data racks 7 are controlled to independently vary the removal of cooling fluid from each of the racks according to the temperatures sensed by sensors 32 and 33. Nakazato et al. teaches controller 40 independently controlling the flow rate of each return (Figure 2); and a plurality of temperature sensors 32, 33 and controller 40 independently controlling the returns in response to the

Application/Control Number: 10/697,694

Art Unit: 3744

measured condition (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply these air removal control features of Nakazato et al. to the plenum system of Spinazzola et al. for the purpose of accurately controlling the temperatures of the data racks.

As per claim 6, Nakazato et al. further teaches the controller controlling the speed of the fan (in response to sensors 32 and 33 at step 105).

As per claim 51, Nakazato et al. further teaches independently controlling the returns based on sensing temperature at locations outside the racks (step 105).

Claims 12, 25, 38, 58-61, 63-66, and 68-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazato et al. in view of Yamagishi et al.

As per claims 12, 25, and 38, Nakazato et al. discloses activating cooling system 11 and providing openings in a plurality of returns 7b, the returns removing cooling fluid from a plurality of data racks; sensing the temperature of the racks (by temperature sensor 33); and varying the removal of cooling fluid from the racks based on the temperature being outside a predetermined range (e.g., a range to provide an optimum temperature distribution within the room space based on set temperature Ts (column 5, lines 58-65)). Nakazato et al. does not specifically teach the returns being open able and closable, but official notice is taken that louvers for opening and closing vents are old and well known in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the purpose of allowing the vents to be closed when the system is not in operation. Further, Nakazato et al. does not specifically state that compressor 17 is a variable capacity compressor. However, as discussed above regarding claim 1, variable speed compressors are common and well-known in the art of

Application/Control Number: 10/697,694

Art Unit: 3744

air conditioning. Yamagishi et al., for example, teaches a multi-return cooling system with a variable speed fan 32 wherein the cooling system is driven by variable speed compressor 14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a variable speed compressor such as that of Yamagishi et al. to the system of Nakazato et al. for the purpose of controlling the degree of cooling performed by the system.

As per claims 58, 63, and 68, Nakazato et al. further teaches independently controlling the returns based on sensing temperature at locations outside the racks (step 105).

As per claims 59, 64, and 69, controlling compressor speed is taught by Yamagishi et al. as discussed above regarding claims 12, 25, and 38.

As per claims 60, 65, and 70, see discussion above of similar claim 56.

As per claims 61 and 66, Nakazato et al. teaches varying the speed of the fan as discussed above regarding claims 12, 25, and 38.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 53, 54, 57, 62, and 67 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 703-305-2711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:30, with first Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,694 Page 6

Art Unit: 3744

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on 703-308-2597. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

MARC NORMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER